

**THE MINUTES OF THE 531ST STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**10 NOVEMBER 2006
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029
MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Kathleen Murray, Office of the City Council President
David Perri, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Eric Cote, Historic Preservation Planner
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery Preservation Alliance
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Peter Kelson, Esq., Blank Rome
Adam Laver, Esq., Blank Rome
Li Chung Pei, AIA
Robert Downs, Yaron Properties
Charles Balsamo, Oxford Construction
Joseph Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Janet Kalter, Old City Civic Association
Peter Miller, Towers & Miller Architects
Craig Sokolow
Craig Deutsch, Harman-Deutsch Architects
Brett Harman, Harman-Deutsch Architects
Paul Drzal, Harman-Deutsch Architects
Anthony Forte, Esq.
Nan Gutterman, Vitteta
Nicole Dress, Vitteta
Gil Rosenthal, FAIA, Wallace Roberts & Todd
Sam Robinson, Wallace Roberts & Todd
Sam Harris, S. Harris & Co.
Frank Rapisardi, Tackett & Co.
Stephen Verner
Mitch Wolfson, Wilington properties, LLC

George Baker
Ray Brogden
Peter Adels
Michael Closeme
Christopher Feranec
Stephen Maffei, Landmark Design
Tony Tartaglia, Landmark Design
Carolina Peña, YCH Architects
Donato J. Pignetti
J. Smith
John Harkins
Rev. Joy L. Griffin
Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Erik Gabell, Paradigm Realty Alliance, LLC

531ST STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 531st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Sklaroff, Merriman, Murray, Perri, Rivera, Schaaf, Smyler, Sugrue, and Wilds were in attendance.

MINUTES OF THE 530TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Rivera, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes as corrected of the 530th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 October 2006.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 31 OCTOBER 2006

Vincent Rivera, Chair

218-226 ARCH STREET, LITTLE BOY'S COURT

Owner: 218 Arch Street, L.P., Yaron Properties, Oxford Construction Development, Inc.

Applicant: Adam Laver, Esq., Blank Rome

History: vacant lot, non-contributing in Old City Historic District

218 and 220 Arch Street, individual designations rescinded in 2006

Little Boys Court designated as part of Historic Street Paving Thematic District

Project: In concept, construct 23-story building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.4) of the preservation ordinance and Standard 9. The Committee opined that the proposed building is not compatible in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, or massing with the site, neighboring structures, adjacent historic street, surroundings, streetscape, and historic district. Its construction would diminish the integrity of the historic district.

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes a 272-foot tall residential and commercial tower for 218-226 Arch Street in the Old City Historic District. An historic street and surface parking lot now occupy the site. The parcel has a complicated history of designations.

The Commission individually designated the two historic buildings that stood at 218 and 220 Arch Street in 1977, but recently rescinded those designations owing to the losses of the buildings.

The Commission designated the parcel in question as part of the Old City Historic District in 2003; it is classified as non-contributing.

The Commission also designated Little Boy's Court or Way, a granite-block and cobblestone street running across this parcel, as a significant resource in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. Little Boy's Court runs across several private parcels; it is not an open street on the City Plan. The paving on it may be the oldest surviving in the city. The Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over Little Boy's Court.

The preservation ordinance [14-2007(2d) and (7d)] limits the Commission's jurisdiction to 45 days of comment on "construction" on "undeveloped" sites. The threshold between review-and-comment and plenary jurisdiction is the "undeveloped/developed" boundary. The Commission has typically considered surface parking lots as "undeveloped" sites and asserted only review-and-comment jurisdiction over new construction on them. However, the Commission has never encountered a situation in which a designated historic street runs across a private parcel on which the only other improvement is a surface parking lot. The application raises a fundamental question: Is a parcel that includes a designated, significant historic street "developed" or "undeveloped" in the eyes of the preservation ordinance? The staff contends that the parcel is "developed" owing to the designated significant street paving, which is located on, not merely adjacent to, the parcel. The staff asserts that the Commission enjoys and should exercise plenary jurisdiction over project proposed for the parcel.

The criteria with which the Commission must review this application are stipulated in the preservation ordinance and *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.4) of the preservation ordinance stipulates that:

In making its determination as to the appropriateness of the proposed alterations, demolition or construction, the Commission shall consider the following:
... the compatibility of the proposed work with the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape.

Furthermore, the Commission's *Rules & Regulations* stipulates that "The Commission, its Architectural Committee and staff shall be guided in their evaluations by *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*." Rehabilitation Standard 9 requires that:

New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

The proposed development, a 23-story glass and steel tower set on a masonry base, would stand about 270 feet tall. The surrounding buildings are, for the most part, masonry and only two to five stories. Christ Church, one of the City's most significant historic buildings, stands only 250 feet to the southeast of the site. Its spire is only 196 feet tall and has dominated the Old City skyline for 250 years.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff recused. Mr. Sugrue assumed the chair. Mr. Farnham presented the application. Attorneys Peter Kelson and Adam Laver, architect Li Chung (Sandy) Pei, and developers Charles Balsamo and Robert Downs attended the meeting to represent the application.

Mr. Wilds suggested that the Commission determine the extent of its authority before addressing the merits of the case. Mr. Wilds stated that he considered the historic street to be as developed as a street could be. He asserted that the Commission would certainly have full jurisdiction over the designated cartway of the historic street. He continued stating that, at this moment, he considers the remainder of the site to be undeveloped; therefore, the Commission's jurisdiction over that portion of the site is significantly less. However, he would like the lawyers' opinions on the jurisdiction matter. Mr. Sugrue acknowledged that this application raises "knotty" questions regarding jurisdiction. He asked his fellow Commissioners to consider whether the designated historic street was analogous to a designated historic building on a parcel.

Ms. Smyler asked if Little Boy's Way runs across the entire parcel. Mr. Kelson displayed a survey of the parcel to be developed and explained that roughly 600 square feet of the street fall within the 21,000 square-foot parcel. He contended that the statement that Little Boy's Way "runs through the development site" is not true. He noted that it was his client's intention to leave Little Boy's Way open and to fully restore it. Ms. Smyler stated that she agreed with the claim by Mr. Wilds that any new construction that touches Little Boy's Way would fall under the full jurisdiction of the Commission.

Mr. Kelson referenced the 21 September 2006 letter from the Commission regarding the rescission of the individual designations of 218 and 220 Arch Street. He stated that the letter made no specific reference to Little Boy's Court "constituting a resource." He noted that "the rescission" clearly states that Section 5.5.c.1 of the Rules & Regulations "had been met." He stated that he would comply with the Commission regarding the historic district and Little Boy's Way. He asserted that the "delisting" had confirmed that "the site itself did not constitute a resource." He stated that they would restore Little Boy's Way to its appropriate use and status. He contended that the "overall development was looked at as part of the delisting and the delisting found that the site itself did not compel continued designation."

Mr. Wilds stated that he would like to hear a presentation regarding the proposed construction. Mr. Wilds also noted that the Architectural Committee minute reported that there had been some discussion regarding whether this application sought an in-concept or final approval. He asked Mr. Kelson to clarify the nature of his application. Mr. Kelson stated that it was originally intended to be an application for final review. Mr. Farnham reported that the application form clearly states "In Concept." Mr. Kelson explained that he had requested an "in-concept" review at the Architectural Committee meeting.

Mr. Farnham disputed Mr. Kelson's claim and clarified that the recent rescission only involved the individual designations of 218 and 220 Arch Street. The Commission did not address nor render any decisions about its jurisdiction over the entire site. He explained that the rescissions, which he supported, only involved the individual designations of the buildings that once stood on 218 and 220 Arch Street. He stated that Mr. Kelson's assertion that the question of the Commission's jurisdiction over the entire site was decided with the rescissions of the 218 and 220 Arch Street individual designations in September 2006 was incorrect. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Farnham to clarify the several designations. The Commission individually designated the buildings at 218 and 220 Arch Street and then rescinded those designations after the buildings

were demolished. The Commission designated Little Boy's Way as a Significant resource in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The Commission designated lot at 218-226 Arch Street as a non-contributing site in the Old City Historic District. Mr. Wilds suggested that the Commission held full jurisdiction over the section of Little Boy's Way on this parcel but only review-and-comment jurisdiction over the remainder of the site.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that this application presents a unique situation for the Commission. He opined that an historic street should be considered as important as an historic building. He asserted that the Commission should not distinguish between the two; both are historic resources. It should exert full jurisdiction in this case. He explained that Lawrence Copeland, the Commission's legal counsel, had, in the past, asserted that the Commission has full jurisdiction over lots when historic resources stand on them, even if the resources only occupy small portions of the lots. He cited the applications Front and Walnut Streets and the National Products parcels as examples.

Mr. Kelson stated that he was not questioning the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over Little Boy's Way, but he contended that, if the Commission intended to exercise full jurisdiction over the entire site, then it should have expressed it in the delisting letter.

Mr. Wilds stated that it was helpful to view the street as a building, but that it might be viewed as an object as well. Mr. Farnham clarified that the ordinance defines an object as movable.

Mr. Pei, the architect, explained the design process for this development. He stated that their intention was to create an infill building that would heal the ruptured fabric of Old City. He noted that this site was one of the few undeveloped parcels in the district capable of providing a great impact. Mr. Pei stated that Little Boy's Way is currently in disrepair and that his intention has always been to restore it and incorporate it into the development. Mr. Sugrue asked for clarification on the plans for the remainder of the street, aside from the 600 square feet that fall within the development site. Mr. Kelson stated that the developer would work with the other owners to restore the entirety of Little Boy's Way. Mr. Pei further explained that their design picks up on the many courts and alleys of Old City. He also stated that the scale of the building is intended to complement the steeple of Christ Church while responding to the predominant heights of the surrounding buildings. He also noted that the ratio of solid versus glass at the base could be adjusted as the Committee had suggested.

Mr. Kelson stated that the garage would be entered from Arch Street, not Little Boy's Way. Mr. Sugrue noted that the façade along Little Boy's Way would be opaque glass and brick.

Mr. Wilds asked the applicants if they had considered a shorter building. Mr. Pei answered that the building would become boxy and heavy if the height is reduced. Its elegant vertical thrust would be lost. Mr. Kelson stated that his client would present a revised proposal to the Commission if the Zoning Board of Adjustment does not approve the height variance. Ms. Smyler noted that, owing to the pending review by the Zoning Board, it would be premature for the Commission to render a decision. Mr. Kelson stated that it would be helpful for his client if the Commission offered comments on the proposal.

Mr. Rivera stated that the proposed density of the development threatens Little Boy's Way. He contended that the Commission should exercise full jurisdiction over the parcel to protect the designated historic resource. Mr. Rivera moved to review the proposal for 218-26 Arch Street

with full jurisdiction, owing to the impact of the proposed development on Little Boy's Way. No one seconded Mr. Rivera's motion.

Mr. Gallery agreed that the proposal would have a negative impact on Little Boy's Way, but noted that the Commission had not addressed its impact on the district as a whole. He reminded the Commission that there is a 65-foot height limit in Old City.

Joseph Shiavo of the Old City Civic Association requested that the Commission exercise full jurisdiction over the entire parcel, owing to the designation of Little Boy's Way.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to table the application for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 6 to 1. Mr. Rivera dissented. Mr. Perri abstained. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

112 ROXBOROUGH AVENUE

Owner: Merion Builders, LLC; Luigi Corrodo

Applicant: Michael Santoro

History: Designated 12/14/1983

Project: Partial demolition, construct rear addition, alter roofline

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear and roofline of the building, construct a new roof with a non-historic roofline, and construct an addition. This application also proposes to alter the front façade of the building by infilling the existing windows and cutting a new fenestration pattern of two windows on each floor. All the facades will be stucco and a stucco band will run between each floor along the front and side of the building. Colonial Revival window surrounds with a keystone motif are also proposed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Côté presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Kevin Smith of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council stated that his organization opposed the proposal because the developer had not consulted with the community. Joy Griffin, a resident of the 100-block of Roxborough Avenue, voiced her concerns about this development, stating that the developers have not contacted the community. She asked the Commission to review this proposal with diligence and care. Ms. Griffin reported that the block had received a \$20,000 grant from the City's Historic Home Repair Program to restore facades. She asserted that, if approved, this project would change the scale and rhythm of the historic street at precisely the moment when the City was funding its restoration. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance echoed the concerns of the community.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposal. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

248 N. LAWRENCE STREET

Owner: Donato J. Pignetti

Applicant: Carolina Pena

History: undeveloped site in Old City Historic District, designated 12/12/2003

Project: Construct four-story residence with garage

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee commented that the application is incomplete and that the large opening at the first-floor front is incompatible with the historic district.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story residence on a vacant lot within the Old City Historic District. The lot sits between a 1960 non-contributing garage building and an 1820 significant Greek Revival Rowhouse. The building would be constructed of red brick. An open garage with the main entrance would occupy the first floor at the front. The second and third floors would have large openings of similar dimensions as the garage. They would be fenestrated with several panels of glass and separated by aluminum cladding. The fourth floor is set back from the façade and would not be visible from the street.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Commission. Carolina Peña of YCH Architects and developer Donato J. Pignetti represented the application.

MOTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's comment and to comment that the application is incomplete and that the large opening at the first-floor front is incompatible with the historic district. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion.

Mr. Wilds asked why the Committee had deemed the application incomplete. Ms. Cote stated that Daniela Voith of the Committee had stated that it was not possible to review the application without an elevation drawing showing the front façade in relation to the other front facades on the block. Ms. Peña offered updated renderings to the Commission which detailed revisions to the garage entrance at the first floor. Most important, the rendering showed the addition of a garage door.

Mr. Schaaf requested a clarification on the proposed materials. Mr. Pignetti stated that they would use brick to match the adjoining house. The garage door would be a stained wood. Mr. Pignetti noted his willingness to implement the Commission's suggestions.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Ms. Smyler and Mr. Schaaf withdrew their motion.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to comment favorably on the revised proposal. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 8 to 0. Ms. Murray abstained.

1928 PINE STREET

Owner: Mark Ansley

Applicant: Peter Miller

History: Built 1889, Frank Miles Day, architect; designated 2/8/1995

Project: Replace front façade windows with wood simulated divided light muntin windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Marvin twenty-over-one simulated-divided-light wood windows for the second and third-floor front façade, with the staff to review shop drawings.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the second and third-floor windows of this Queen Anne Revival Rowhouse with simulated-divided-light sash. This house originally had twenty-over-one wood true-divided-light windows.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Peter Miller represented the application.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve Marvin twenty-over-one simulated-divided-light wood windows for the second and third-floor front façade, with the staff to review shop drawings. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

236 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: Craig Sokolow

Applicant: Harmon Deutsch

History: c. 1870; contributing in district; designated 2/8/1995

Project: Rehabilitation of front façade and construction of roof-top addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the inaccurate reconstruction of the storefront and dormers, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of the addition, provided the front parapet on the penthouse is deleted, the penthouse itself is shifted farther back on the building from the front façade to minimize visibility, and simpler, undivided windows and doors are installed in the addition, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct, but not restore the storefront and upper stories of this contributing building in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The storefront reconstruction is loosely based on a historic photograph. Neither the design nor the materials proposed reflect the original. The applicant proposes concrete and aluminum rather than wood. Also, the rebuilding of the dormers in the mansard is conjectural and not justified by either material or photographic evidence.

The application also proposes the addition of a fourth floor with a front deck. The deck would be set back five feet from the edge of the mansard, and the fourth-floor would be set back twenty feet from the edge. The addition would be finished in smooth stucco and accentuated by multi-light windows and doors. A second three-story addition is proposed for the rear of the building, which is not visible from any public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Owner Craig Sokolow and architects Craig Deutsch and Paul Drzal represented the application.

Mr. Deutsch presented revised plans to the Commission. He stated that the revised drawings incorporate the Committee's suggestions. Mr. Rivera confirmed that the revised drawings comply with the Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to approve the revised proposal as submitted at the Commission meeting of 10 November 2006, with the staff to review details. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1328-1332 RACE STREET

Owner: PA Convention Center Authority

Applicant: Anthony, Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing LLP

History: 1925 by architect John Molitor

Project: Demolish building completely, salvage of architectural elements, rescind historic designation

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition of the fire house at 1328-1332 Race Street as necessary in the public interest, pursuant to the Commission's approval in concept of October 2002, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

1. HABS documentation of the building is submitted to and accepted by the National Park Service;
2. The demolition permit is not approved until the funding for the expansion is certified;
3. The building in question is the last property to be demolished on the site; and
4. The identified historic artifacts are salvaged and stored according to an approved artifact management plan.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of the firehouse at 1328-1332 Race Street to clear the site for the expansion of the Pennsylvania Convention Center. The Commission approved in concept the demolition in the public interest with conditions in October 2002. The current application accepts the conditions imposed in 2002:

1. HABS recordation;
2. Issuance of demolition permit after certification of funding for the expansion;
3. Last property to be demolished on the site; and
4. Salvage and retention of historic artifacts for potential reuse in an exhibition.

The demolition application included a request for the rescission of the designation after the demolition is complete. The rescission request will be forwarded to the Committee on Historic Designation and the Commission at the appropriate time. It was not considered by the Architectural Committee.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Anthony Forte and architect Nan Gutterman represented the application.

Mr. Wilds voiced his concern about the rescission, stating that it would be inappropriate to rescind the designation if the project did not proceed and the firehouse was not demolished. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Farnham to clarify the rescission request. Mr. Farnham stated that the applicant has requested that the rescission request be considered only after the demolition is complete. He reiterated that the demolition request is not before the Commission today.

MOTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the demolition of the fire house at 1328-1332 Race Street as necessary in the public interest, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

1. HABS documentation of the building is submitted to and accepted by the National Park Service;
2. The demolition permit is not approved until the funding for the expansion is certified;
3. The building in question is the last property to be demolished on the site; and
4. The identified historic artifacts are salvaged and stored according to an approved artifact management plan.

Mr. Rivera seconded the motion.

Mr. Sklaroff asked what expertise the Committee had to determine whether the proposed demolition was necessary in the public interest. Mr. Farnham responded that the Committee had no expertise in the area, but was predicated its recommendation on the Commission's earlier approval in concept. Mr. Sklaroff reminded the Commission that it had approved the demolition of three buildings on the 1900-block of Sansom Street for a parking garage after it found that the project was necessary in the public interest. However, the court overturned the approval on the ground that economic development alone is not necessary in the public interest. Mr. Sklaroff then asked how the justification for this demolition could be differentiated from the earlier justification, which was rejected by the court. Mr. Wilds stated that this case was very different from the parking garage case. Mr. Gallery interrupted Mr. Wilds; Mr. Sklaroff ruled that Mr. Gallery's comment was out of order and asked him to wait until the Commission requested public input before speaking. The parking garage would have had a very limited, purely economic impact on a very small area; the Convention Center, on the other hand, would have an enormous impact on the entire Philadelphia region that would transcend the narrowly defined economic realm. Mr. Sugrue concurred and stated he had opposed of the parking garage project, but had supported the demolition of the firehouse. He suggested that the Commission accept its earlier decision to approve in concept and not reargue the case. Mr. Sklaroff noted that both the Philadelphia Parking Authority and the Pennsylvania Convention Center Authority are public entities. He reiterated that differentiating between the two cases could be difficult. Others disagreed, asserting that the projects and the missions of the two entities are very different. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the Commission, which is differentiating between the two public interest claims, is fortunate because the Law Department has opined that Judge Carafiello's decision in the parking garage case did not set a precedent. He stressed that the Commission must be consistent. He observed that one could argue that the fire station is much more significant historically than the three building to be demolished for the parking garage.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Forte, the Convention Center's attorney, to justify his claim that this demolition is necessary in the public interest. Mr. Forte stated that the need for an expanded Convention Center is greater today than it was in 2002. The 2002 application requested in-concept approval; the current application requests final approval. Mr. Forte reviewed the four conditions recommended by the Architecture Committee and opined these conditions were too stringent. He noted that the Committee had recommended that the HABS recordation be submitted to and accepted by the National Park Service; he asserted that this new requirement was unexpected, exceeded the condition in the Commission's in-concept approval, and would add a considerable burden. Mr. Wilds noted that digital photography is more prevalent than 35mm photography today; he asked why the proposed condition would require an obsolete photograph system. Ms. Gutterman stated the Pennsylvania Historic & Museum Commission does not accept digital records. Ms. Gutterman offered to provide both analog and digital

photographs. Mr. Forte agreed to amend the first condition to include digital photographs. Mr. Forte asserted that the fourth condition recommended by the Committee also exceeded the Commission's approval in concept. He stated that the Committee now urged the retention of a curator to craft a plan for the salvaging, conservation, and exhibition of the artifacts. He contended that such a requirement would be burdensome and costly for the Authority. He submitted an inventory of the artifacts proposed for salvaging and stated that they would be retained by the Pennsylvania Convention Center Authority and/or donated to the Fireman's Museum on N. 2nd Street. Mr. Forte distributed his proposed wording for the four conditions to the Commission.

The amended "Proposed Conditions to Final Approval -- Demolition of Fire Station (1328-32 Race St.)" stipulated the following:

Prior to Issuance of any Demolition Permit, Applicant shall provide the Philadelphia Historical Commission Staff with the following:

1. HISTORIC DOCUMENTATION: A set of measured drawings depicting existing as-built conditions, including Floor Plans (4 Sheets) and Exterior Elevations (4 Sheets), as well as 35mm and digital color photographs depicting the interior and exterior existing conditions. Also, a letter from the Athenaeum of Philadelphia (or other similar historical society), agreeing to accept the referenced drawings and photographs as part of a local architectural archive.
2. FINANCING: Evidence that the full \$700 million budget for the Pennsylvania Convention Center expansion project has been authorized as part of Pennsylvania capital budget legislation passed by the Pennsylvania General Assembly, and signed by the Governor.
3. ORDER OF DEMOLITION: A letter from the Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia (the entity handling all demolitions in connection with the Pennsylvania Convention Center expansion project), stating that the Fire Station (1328-32 Race St.) property shall be the last property to be demolished.
4. SALVAGE OF HISTORIC ARTIFACTS: A report including (1) a List of Artifacts to be Salvaged (attached) and a digital photo of each individual artifact to be salvaged; (2) Plans and/or specifications indicating how the salvaged items are to be removed from the building and temporarily stored during construction in a safe and professional manner; and (3) a List indicating where each of the salvaged artifacts will be relocated (i.e., public display space within the Pennsylvania Convention Center, a local historical society or museum, or a Convention Center storage facility).

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Farnham if the proposed conditions were appropriate; Mr. Farnham replied that he had not had a chance to study them, but that, a first glance, they appeared appropriate. He explained to the Commission that he had asked Mr. Forte to propose revisions to the recommended conditions to remove the ambiguities from them.

Mr. Gallery stated that the Commission should rescind designations at the same time it grants demolitions to avoid the problem of "phantom designations." Mr. Sklaroff stated that Mr. Gallery's discussion of the rescission is out of order unless the discussion is relevant to the pending motion. Mr. Gallery claimed that his discussion of the rescission was germane. Mr.

Sklaroff countered that it was not unless it pertained directly to the motion before the Commission. Mr. Gallery stated that the Preservation Alliance supports the demolition on the grounds that it is necessary in the public interest. He asserted that the Alliance's position on the demolition is consistent with the court's decision on the parking garage as well as other Commission decisions predicated on the "necessary in the public interest" clause. He stated that he wanted to place on the record the organization's reasons for supporting the demolition. He offered to read a written statement into the record. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that he submit it in written form instead. Mr. Gallery offered to summarize it.

Mr. Gallery stated that the proposal to demolish 1328-1332 Race Street for expansion of the Convention Center was previously reviewed by the Historical Commission and approved under that provision of the ordinance that allows for demolition when "necessary to the public interest." The proposal before the Commission today is essentially the same as the previous one and the justification of demolition as "necessary to the public interest" is also the same. The Preservation Alliance supports this proposal and supports this demolition as being appropriate under the "necessary to the public interest" provision of the ordinance. Since the ordinance provides no guidelines on what "necessary to the public interest" means or guidelines on the type of submission necessary to demonstrate that demolition is "necessary to the public interest," the Alliance would like to place in the record of this meeting our reasons for believing that this demolition meets the test of being "necessary to the public interest." Our understanding of this provision is based on an analysis of previous actions by the Commission and on the ruling of the Court of Common Pleas in the matter of the demolition of properties in the 1900 block of Sansom Street by the Philadelphia Parking Authority. There are two aspects of the phrase "necessary to the public interest" which we feel need to be understood both independently and in relationship to one another. It is the Alliances' view that the term "necessary" means "essential." The demolition of the historic resource is "essential" in order to achieve the public interest represented by the proposed project. If it were not essential then there would be no justification for the demolition. Furthermore, we believe that the test of whether the demolition is "essential" is that there is a functional relationship of some type between the proposed project and something else that makes it essential for the proposed project to be in the location of the historic resource. For example, in the case of demolition of Smith Hall at the University of Pennsylvania—a demolition approved as necessary to the public interest—it was essential to build the new research center on the site of Smith Hall because it had to be connected to other research facilities immediately adjacent in order to operate. In the case of demolition approved for the School for the Deaf the same was true; the new facility had to be in a location where it could connect to the existing school for operational purposes. "Necessary" therefore means essential to be in this location because of a functional relationship or connection to something else. The Common Pleas Court decision in the 19th and Sansom case explicitly stated that the economic benefits of real estate taxes, other tax revenues and economic benefits derived from job creation are not reasonable definitions of the "public interest" as that term is used in the ordinance. The Court clearly stated that such benefits apply to all real estate projects and if this were the meaning of "public interest" then any historical building could be demolished for a new project. Public interest here means a much broader public purpose—a broad economic or social impact that goes beyond the normal benefits of real estate development. In the case of the School for the Deaf, the School was proposing to build a high school component of its program.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Gallery to conclude his remarks. Mr. Gallery registered an objection to the request, claiming that the Commission was obligated to hear his testimony. Mr. Sklaroff offered Mr. Gallery three additional minutes to complete his testimony.

Mr. Gallery continued, reiterating that the School for the Deaf was proposing to build a high school component of its program. No high school for the deaf existed in the Philadelphia region. Therefore, it was correct to say that there was a broad “public interest” in the creation of this facility. Both of these definitions apply to the demolition proposed here for the Convention Center. First, it is necessary because it is “essential” that the expansion of the Convention Center be on this site in order that it connect to the existing Convention Center. There is no other location where an expansion of the Center can occur. Second, it is in the “public interest” because the Convention Center serves a broad public purpose. It supports hotels, restaurants and the tourist industry of the city. Its indirect impact on the economy of the city is broader than the taxes or revenues attributable directly to the center. We believe that this project not only meets the test of what “necessary to the public interest” means, but that it further supports an understanding of this phrase consistent with its application in both the Smith Hall and School for the Deaf decisions. Therefore, the Alliance supports the proposed demolition as being “necessary to the public interest”.

Mr. Wilds noted that not all Commissioners agree with Mr. Gallery’s definition of “necessary in the public interest.” Mr. Wilds opined that Smith Hall was not a good example and reported that he had voted against that demolition.

MOTION: Messrs. Sugrue and Rivera amended their motion, removing the four conditions recommended by the Architectural Committee and replacing them with the four conditions presented to the Commission at its meeting of 10 November 2006 in writing by attorney Anthony Forte and amended. The Commission voted unanimously to approve the demolition of the fire house at 1328-1332 Race Street as necessary in the public interest, provided the four conditions presented to the Commission at its meeting of 10 November 2006 in writing by attorney Anthony Forte and amended are satisfied.

109-131 N. 2ND STREET, 117-125 ARCH STREET, 128 ELFRETH’S ALLEY

Owner: National East Associates, LP; Steve Patron; Paradigm Realty Alliance; Robertson Douglass Group

Applicant: Anthony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing LLP

History: various nineteenth and twentieth-century buildings; tile façade c.1950-1960

Project: In concept - Demolish buildings, demolish and reconstruct tile façade, landscape park, construct 3-story townhouses and 6- and 10-story multi-unit residential buildings

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the proposal for 128 Elfreth’s Alley; approval in concept of the reconstruction of the tile façade; and approval in concept of the locations and massings of the proposed townhouses and 6- and 10-story buildings with open space, park landscaping, and underground parking accessed from Arch Street, with the understanding that the designs, but not the locations and massings, of the new buildings will continue to evolve.

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to convert the National Products site of N. 2nd Street between Arch Street and Elfreth’s Alley to a residential complex. The Commission approved similar in-concept proposals in March 2003 and August 2004.

The only significant deviation from the in-concept approval of August 2004 is the current request to demolish and rebuild the tile facades. The applicant claims that the rate of failure of the tiles is accelerating and that the entirety of the tiles will need replacement in the near future. The

applicant furthermore claims that, if the tile facades are not reconstructed, then the costs of maintaining the facades will exceed the financial capability of the new condominium owners' association.

The orange tile façades and all of the buildings on the site except 128 Elfreth's Alley would be demolished. The tile façades would be rebuilt to match the original façades with new tiles and salvaged doors, windows, signage, and other elements including the granite channels. A 6-story commercial and residential building would be constructed behind the reconstructed tile façade on N. 2nd Street. A 10-story commercial and residential building would be constructed on the Arch Street portion of the site. The entrance to the underground parking garage would be located at the east end of the Arch Street building. Ten 3-story townhouses would be constructed around an open courtyard at the northeastern corner of the site. Flagpole Park, at the intersection of N. 2nd Street and Elfreth's Alley, would be landscaped. The building at 128 Elfreth's Alley would be retained; the opening created at the rear by the demolition of the N. 2nd Street buildings, which would not be visible to the public, would be infilled with CMU and a brick veneer. The building at 128 would be donated to the Elfreth's Alley Association.

The Architectural Committee discussed whether to recommend approval of the reconstruction of the tile facades at great length. Eventually, all but one Committee member agreed that reconstruction was the best option, given the deteriorating condition of the tiles and the numerous complicating factors.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Anthony Forte, architect Gil Rosenthal, and consultant Sam Harris represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked about 128 Elfreth's Alley. Mr. Farnham noted that he had offered to approve it at the staff level. After asking for objections from his fellow Commissioners and receiving none, Mr. Sklaroff directed the staff to review the 128 Elfreth's Alley portion of the application.

Mr. Forte introduced the new construction. Mr. Forte explained that the locations and massings of the buildings presented today are identical to those approved in concept previously. He also stated that the project is significantly under the FAR for the site. He noted that the tallest portion of the complex is ten stories; it is at the south on the Arch Street. Mr. Forte explained that the taller and denser sections of the complex were located to the south away from Elfreth's Alley and Appletree Court.

Joseph Schiavo of the Old City Civic Association stated that his organization approved in concept of the project in its current form. He stated that his organization will continue to work with the developer as the project evolves.

Mr. Forte then called upon Mr. Rosenthal to provide a detailed summary of the proposal, especially the design of the six-story building, using a model. Mr. Rosenthal stated that he sought to pay homage to the tile façade, not compete with, overpower, or mimic it. He stated that he would simplify the new building above the tile wall. It would be divided from the tile façade below by a horizontal setback like that at the new addition to the Western Union building on Locust Street. He noted that he would like to bring the upper floors, above the break, forward to the same plane as the tile façade. He added that he had not yet decided on materials for the upper floors. Mr. Schaaf stated that he approved of shifting the upper stories of the six-story building forward to the plane of the tile facades. He also remarked that the east and west elevations of the ten-story building on Arch Street are not as advanced as the remainder of the

design. He opined that they look like a 1950s public housing project. Mr. Rosenthal accepted the criticism and stated that he will continue to develop the party wall facades. Mr. Forte stated that he hopes to include windows on the party walls.

Mr. Gallery expressed his support of an approval in concept. Justifying his support for a tall building on Arch Street, he noted that the proposal was first approved prior to the adoption of the 65-foot height restriction. He also noted that the shifting of the front façade of the six-story building to the sidewalk line improved the design considerably.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to approve in concept the locations and massings of the proposed townhouses and 6- and 10-story buildings (with the west-facing upper facade of the 6-story building in the same plane as the historic tile façade below), the open space, park landscaping, and underground parking accessed from Arch Street, with the understanding that the designs, but not the locations and massings, of the new buildings will continue to evolve. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Forte introduced Mr. Harris, who spoke about the tiles. Mr. Harris stated that the tiles are rapidly deteriorating. In the past two years, the total number of failing tiles has risen precipitously. In 2004, 200 tiles needed significant intervention; now, 800 require intervention. Mr. Harris noted that the tiles are still produced. He explained that he will request samples of the remanufactured tiles from two manufacturers. Mr. Sklaroff asked about the materials of the extant tiles. Mr. Harris replied the tiles are made of low-fire terra cotta with a one-millimeter glazed backing. He stated that the new tiles would be identical in appearance but stronger and better glazed. He asserted that this is the appropriate moment to rebuild the facades with new tiles. Mr. Forte remarked that his client is seeking approval in concept to rebuild the tile facades with new tiles and salvaged pieces. Mr. Wilds agreed with the concept of rebuilding the facades with new tiles, but he warned the applicants that any final approval would depend on the samples of the replicated tiles. He stated that, if the sample was not a good match, then he would advocate for repair, not replacement. Mr. Schaaf asked about applying a sealant to the existing tiles to prevent further deterioration. Mr. Harris replied that sealing would only have a lifespan of about two years. Mr. Schaaf asked about the mottling on the tiles. Mr. Harris replied the mottling was a result of the firing process; not all of the tiles are exposed to the firing in the same way. Ms. Smyler requested that the applicants present an update on the condition of the historic tile when they return to the Commission for final approval. Mr. Sklaroff reminded the applicants that, if adopted, the in-concept approval would not automatically lead to a final approval. The final approval will be predicated on the review of the tile samples.

Mr. Gallery opined that the original elements on the tile façade should be salvaged for reinstallation. Mr. Schiavo noted for the record that the application proposes to completely demolish the walls behind the tile. Mr. Forte commented on Mr. Schiavo's assertion, stating that the walls had been corrupted with non-historic openings and infill. He stated that his client intends to build a stronger wall that will serve as a backing for the new tile.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to approve in concept the reconstruction of the tile façade. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1701 LOCUST STREET

Owner: CDF, Philadelphia Holding, LP

Applicant: Martin Jay Tackett

History: 1923-1925, Frank Hahn and Brian Baylinson; significant in district.

Project: Alter ground floor commercial space.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the windows, doors, and awnings, with the staff to review details, but denial of the signage, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: The applicant submitted an application for alterations to this restaurant space in October 2006 and withdrew the proposal at the Commission meeting. The applicant now returns with a modified proposal.

The current application proposes to install windows and doors. The space does not retain its original windows and doors. The windows and door would be aluminum and would be reminiscent of the original units known through photographs. The proposed units would be out-swinging casements with transoms. The applicant also proposes to install awnings. The awnings over the windows would be of the shed type; the door would have a square awning. The Chancellor Street elevation currently has two blocked openings. The applicant proposes to reopen them and install fixed windows. The application also proposes to install halo-lit letters and a projecting double-sided sign. This two signs would be attached directly on to the limestone façade of the building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Frank Rapisardi represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicant if he planned to press the issue of the signage with the Commission. Mr. Rapisardi replied he would press it only "very slightly sir." He then distributed a revised plan for the signage. Mr. Schaaf noted the Art Commission has jurisdiction over signage and must also review this proposal. Mr. Rapisardi pointed out the three types of signage in the application: the signage on the entrance canopy, the parking sign, and the projecting blade sign. Mr. Schaaf stated the projecting blade sign was not permitted by the zoning for the site. Mr. Wilds asked about the shape of the awning over the door. Mr. Rapisardi explained that it would be rectangular, like the awning at the main entrance to the building. Ms. Smyler suggested that the Commission deny the signage. Mr. Schaaf explained that he is a member of the Signage Committee of the Art Commission. He stated that the Art Commission does not permit lettering on the sides of the awnings. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the applicant speak with Mr. Schaaf about the jurisdiction and policies of the Art Commission. He noted that the Art Commission may not approve the signage.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the windows, doors, and awnings, with the staff to review details, but to deny the signage, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1225 PANAMA STREET

Owner: Laura Spear

Applicant: Stephen Verner

History: c. 1830

Project: Reconstruct roof with enlarged front dormer and redesigned rear dormer

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal as submitted, but approval of the reconstruction of the historic roof and dormer at the front and altered roof and enlarged dormer at the rear.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish and reconstruct the roof of this house. The house recently suffered a fire. The applicant would reconstruct the roof with altered dormers. The front dormer would be replaced with a widened two-bay dormer that would be clad with Hardiplank. The dormer would have six-over-six wood windows. At the rear the applicant proposes to reconstruct the widened dormer that already exists, but with French doors and a balconnette rather than the two windows that are currently present. A skylight is proposed at either side of the rear dormer. The roof would be finished with a dark grey asphalt shingle.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Stephen Verner represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt Architectural Committee's recommendation and to deny the proposal as submitted, but to approve the reconstruction of the historic roof and dormer at the front and altered roof and enlarged dormer at the rear. Ms. Murray seconded the motion.

Mr. Verner stated that the property was deemed Imminently Dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Owing to a fire, the roof must be replaced. Mr. Verner explained that rebuilding with an enlarged dormer would double the living space on the top floor from 100 to 200 square feet. He also stated that the adjacent houses on both sides have enlarged dormers. He also cited examples of enlarged dormers on Iseminger Street.

WITHDRAWAL OF SECOND: Ms. Murray withdrew her second to the motion proffered by Mr. Wilds.

Mr. Wilds stated that this may be the only surviving dormer of its type on the block. He also noted that the motion would approve an enlarged dormer at the rear.

SECOND: Mr. Schaaf seconded Mr. Wild's motion to adopt Architectural Committee's recommendation and to deny the proposal as submitted, but to approve the reconstruction of the historic roof and dormer at the front and altered roof and enlarged dormer at the rear.

Mr. Verner asserted that this is not the only surviving dormer on the street. There are others. He insisted that the Commission allow the owners to enlarge the dormers and make this building "more inhabitable."

Mr. Sklaroff asked when the dormers were altered on the neighboring properties. Mr. Baron replied that the dormers were altered many years prior to designation, perhaps as early as 1905. He also explained that the houses with the enlarged dormers on Iseminger Street did not have original historic dormers; therefore, the Commission's approval of large dormers did not

necessitate the demolition of historic dormers. Moreover, the houses on Iseminger Street are half-gabled and therefore have even less space on the top floor than these full-gable houses. Mr. Verner asserted that denying this proposal would freeze this house in time. He contended that the Commission should approve improvements necessary for contemporary lifestyles.

ACTION: The Commission voted to approve the motion proffered by Messrs Wilds and Schaaf to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposal as submitted, but approve the reconstruction of the historic roof and dormer at the front and altered roof and enlarged dormer at the rear by a vote of 7 to 2. Ms. Murray and Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

1731 DIAMOND STREET

Owner: Willington Properties, Mitch Wolfson, principal

Applicant: George Baker, architect

History: 1889, Contributing to Diamond Street Historic District

Project: Renovate exterior

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows are wood, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore portions of the front façade of this rowhouse. It proposes removing a later storefront and installing windows and masonry to match adjacent houses in the row. A portion of later brick at the water table base will remain as will the door. The applicant proposes to build up the missing portion of brownstone above the base in colored stucco.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Owner Mitch Wolfson and architect George Baker represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked about the appropriateness of the shutters and two-over-two windows. The applicants offered to work with the staff to determine the appropriateness of the windows and shutters. Mr. Baron agreed to work with the applicants.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, provided the windows are wood, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

433 N. 39TH STREET

Owner: Joel Schmitt

Applicant: Ray Brogden

History: built 1895 by Wright & Prentzal

Project: Construct ADA ramp and install vinyl windows in front façade

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised ramp, but denial of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 6. The Committee noted that one-over-one wood windows would be appropriate.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the addition of a ramp and vinyl windows on the front façade of the building. The application also proposes a new door.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Ray Brogden represented the application.

Mr. Brogden stated that he accepted the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve of the revised ramp and one-over-one wood windows, but deny the proposed vinyl windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

563 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: Allied Realty, LLC

Applicant: Brett Harman, architect

History: c. 1855, alterations c. 1910, storefront added c.1935

Project: Alter exterior including masonry openings

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes rehabilitating this store and apartments for residential use. The former owner replaced several side windows with vinyl units; a violation was requested. The application proposes to restore the front windows with two-over-two sash and remove the capping from the window frames on the side facade. Two window openings will be cut into the side. One door will be reopened and one rear window closed. The other windows, some of which are illegal, will be retained. A skylight monitor would be added to the roof to allow greater headroom at the upper floor. The existing metal panel storefront will be restored and a new door added. Decks will be added to the rear ell.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Brett Harman represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicant to describe the proposed use of the rehabilitated building. Mr. Harmon stated that the ground floor would be commercial space and the upper floors residential. He added that a tenant had not yet leased the commercial space.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2215 MADISON SQUARE

Owner/Applicant: Peter Adels

History: 1870, Charles Leslie, developer

Project: Repair and replace metal garden fence

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, but approval of a fence with finials replicating the historic fence, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes repairing and replacing parts of a fence that encloses the shared garden that runs down the center of Madison Square, which is a pedestrian street. Other residents may repair and replace the fences in front of their properties based on the standard

set by this application. The application proposes constructing new sections of fence in black painted steel, but without the historic fleur-de-lis finials. The applicant does not wish to replicate the finials for cost, consistency, and safety reasons.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Owner Peter Adels represented the application.

Mr. Adels explained that the fence is in disrepair and should be restored. Mr. Sklaroff asked Ms. Murray if the City Council might aid with the restoration. Ms. Murray asked the applicant to contact her. Jacob Smith of 2219 Madison Square stated that he hopes to raise funds to stabilize the fence.

Mr. Adels withdrew his application.

309 PINE STREET

Owner/ Applicant: Michael Saponaro, Christopher Feranec

History: Built c. 1809

Project: Construct roof deck on rear ell

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalizing the dormer and approving the deck.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a roof deck on the rear ell of this property. The applicant has submitted photographs showing that the rear dormer has been altered into a door. The proposed deck would be located on the roof of the rear ell, but would have a connecting bridge to the dormer. No details have been provided on this link. In addition, City aerial photographs show that the rear dormer was unaltered until recently; the Commission did not review this change.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Michael Closeme and Tom Krupa represented the application.

Mr. Closeme explained that the dormer was damaged by water during renovations to the neighboring property. When he repaired it, he added the door to the dormer. Both Messrs. Schaaf and Wilds questioned the visibility of the dormer. Mr. Closeme displayed photographs and stated that the upper portion of the rear of the building was barely visible from a pedestrian walkway.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and legalize the dormer and approve the deck. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2320 MADISON SQUARE

Owner: Danforth Builders & Developers, Inc

Applicant: Stephen Maffei

History: Built c. 1870, demolished 1983

Project: New two-story residence

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to the Commission's in-concept approval and Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission approved an application in concept for this property in December 2005. The applicant now returns for final approval. Excepting the rooftop features, the current application proposes the exact design that was approved in concept. The Commission's decision specified the elimination of the roof hatch and deck. The applicant has eliminated the deck, but has retained the hatch to access rooftop condensers.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Stephen Maffei represented the application.

Mr. Wilds observed that the windows look wider than those in the rest of the block. Mr. Maffei responded that the windows are wider to satisfy the egress requirements.

ACTION: Ms. Murray moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, pursuant to the Commission's in-concept approval and Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

6208-6210 GRAYS AVENUE

Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission designated Our Lady of Loreto Church in February 2004 using the address 6214 Grays Avenue. Recently, it was discovered that the address is not the official address assigned by the Board of Revision of Taxes. The official City address is 6208-6210 Grays Avenue. The Law Department has requested that the Commission announce at a public meeting that it is correcting its mistake and revising the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places to reflect the correct address. No action by the Commission is necessary.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 12:50 p.m., Ms. Murray moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.4): In making its determination as to the appropriateness of the proposed alterations, demolition or construction, the Commission shall consider the following:

- ... the compatibility of the proposed work with the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape.